# **AB 2117 AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Wate	ershed Project / Group Case	Study:			
colla of Ca	The overall purpose of this bill is to evaluate how effective community based, collaborative watershed efforts are in contributing to the protection and enhancement of California's natural resources. The State's interest is to empower its citizens to help achieve the State's resource management objectives.				
Age	ncy:	Location:			
Nam	ne:	Title:			
	e of Interview:	Interviewed by:			
Via:	Phone or Face-to-Face				
Item	Question	Response			
1.1	Originating Sponsor or Initiator? Leadership? (officer?)	agency in assisting with this watershed effort?			
1.3	Decision-maker?				
1.4	Funder? Contract Manager? Which program?				
1.5	Participant on Subcommittees?				
1.6	Technical Advisor? Which program?				
1.7	Regulatory? Which laws / regs?				
1.8	Should the agency have a different role than it presently has?				
How	v effective are agencies in as	sisting local watershed projects / groups / programs?			
2.1	Does your agency have sufficient amounts of the following to provide assistance: ?				
	a. technical staff				
	b. time				

Item	Question	Response
	c. funding	
	d. sufficient training of its staff	
	e. education / training efforts of others	
	f. monitoring efforts (trend, project?)	
2.2	How good is the current relationship of your agency [& other agencies] to this group?	
2.3	Have there been any improvements in inter-agency [ and personal ] communication over time because of this group?	
2.4	Where are there gaps in funding at State / Federal / Local / Private levels?	
2.5	How does coordination (or the lack thereof) among the agencies affect the group's ability to protect and enhance the watershed? Give examples.	
2.6	How has your agency helped in a Watershed Assessment?	
2.7	How has your agency helped in the Watershed Plan?	
2.8	How has your agency helped in monitoring (& what type)?	
		fort in protecting and enhancing the watershed?
3.1	What might have happened with watershed conditions had this group not been organized?	
3.2	What successes has this group had? What are its strengths?	
3.3	What failures has it had? What are its weaknesses?	
3.4	Is the watershed scale being used adequate	
3.5	Are there any measurable physical or biological improvements in the watershed's condition since the group began?	
3.6	Is the watershed assessment adequate? The watershed plan?	

Item	Question	Response
	Fu	urther Assistance Needs
4.1	If there is one thing that could make a difference, what would it be?	
4.2	What are your lessons learned as a message to the Legislature?	
4.3	Are the attached General Watershed Principles "on track"?	
4.4	Are there any changes needed in state law to improve state collaboration and cooperation in watershed planning and management?	

## **AB 2117 QUESTIONNAIRE**

The overall purpose of this bill is to evaluate how effective community-based, collaborative watershed efforts are in contributing to the protection and enhancement of California's natural resources. The State's interest is to empower its citizens to help achieve the State's resource management objectives.

Name of watershed "project":		
Interviewee, position, (date of start of position):		
Interviewer(s):		
Interview type (phone, personal interview)	Date of interview:	
71 11 /	<del>-</del>	

Item	Criteria	Response
	Вас	ckground information
1-A	Date present group formed / What stage is the group now: start-up, middle-age, mature?	
1-B	Sponsor / Originator(s) that helped get group started	
1-C	What evidence existed to establish a need? What was the catalyzing issue(s)?	
1-D	Purpose/Mission and Goal(s) of group	
1-E	Size of watershed (acres or sq. miles) / Population (est.)	

Item	Criteria	Response

### **ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS**

How does your local group function and is it effective in protecting and enhancing the watershed?		
2. Membership Composition/ Participation		
2-A	Type of organization agreement (MOU, charter, 501c3, other binding agreement)	
2-B	Part of a regional basin group?	#
2-C	Composition of decision-making body	#
2-D	Absence of any key stakeholder groups, and why	
2-E	Environmental group participation	#
2-F	Landowner participation: by interest groups, ownership size, or other category	
2-G	Tribal involvement (as member or advisory role?)	#
3. Staffi	ng	
3-A	Coordinator? (full or part-time; financial support source; educational background; agency affiliation; independence)	
3-B	Other staff positions funded in this group?	
3-C	Any volunteers for Organizational functions?	
4. Dec	ision-making Process	

AB 2117 questionnaire

Item	Criteria	Response
4-A	Type of decision process (consensus, supermajority, majority) & clearly stated & used (influence on what issues are on table).	·
4-B	Source for decision-making rules: by-laws, meeting rules, ground rules, charter, other	
4-C	Describe group's role in decision-making for the watershed (advisory, forum, policy, advocacy, project implementation, coordination)	
4-D	Chair / officers of group & leadership roles	
4-E	Roles of subcommittees: (Executive/ Steering; Project/Restoration; Fundraising/Finance)	
5. Issue	es & Focus	
5-A	Current issues of focus (top 2?)	#
5-B	Overlay of any external <i>regulatory</i> issues/ process (TMDL, ESA, <i>Stormwater, Land Use</i> ) to original focus	#
5-C	Review & commenting on local development, timber harvest or other projects, if at all; consequences of reviews.	
5-D	Effect of external factors affecting local decision-making (state/fed law, economics, etc)	
	munication, Education, Outreach & Training	
6-A	Frequency of meetings	

Item	Criteria	Response
6-B	Record-keeping (minutes, web, decisions)	
6-C	Any Strategic Plan for Organization?	
6-D	Openness / access to non-members (publicity, newsletters, webpage, field trips, events, info)	
6-E	Development of trust & understanding: a) within group; b) within community	
6-F	Types of adult / community education: workshops, speakers, field trips, publications, other?	
6-G	Any K-12 education program?	
6-H	Funding adequate for education, outreach and/or training?	
7. Fund	ing	
7-A	Quantity / sources of financial support (organizational /process & project costs)	SEE TABLE
7-B	Ranges / trends of funding over years vs. Needs	
7-C	Grant-writing capabilities?	
7-D	Self-sufficiency potential (Membership dues; donations; 501(c)(3) status)?	
7-E	Cost-share requirements & ownership issue	
8. Age	ncy Relations	
8 –A	What agency requirements or regulations affect your watershed (or limit or direct your group's	

Item	Criteria	Response
	goals and activities)? How do they affect your activities? (Ex endangered species laws, local zoning, streambed alteration or wetlands permits, water or waste discharge permits, etc.)	
8-B	How good is the current relationship with agencies: federal, state, local?	
8-C	Any improvements in agency communication & support over time, since project began?	
8-D	How does coordination (or the lack of) among the agencies affect your group's ability to protect and enhance the watershed (may be a positive or negative effect)? Give examples.	
8-E	Role of State watershed program to local group capability – <u>financially, politically,?</u>	
9. Self-	Evaluation	
9-A	Most proud accomplishments of the group?	
9-B	Any self-evaluation done about group process: form, frequency, & results	
9-C	Greatest causes of heartburn within group?	
9-D	Members & others who are least & most pleased with group and its progress to date	
9-E	Expected longevity of group (as long as needed, as long as funded, until projects done, etc.)	

## WATERSHED ASSESSMENT, PLAN AND MONITORING

Item	Criteria	Response	
10. Wa	10. Watershed Assessment & Plan Development [CLARIFY FIRST WHAT IS MEANT BY "ASSESSMENT" & "PLAN"]		
10-A	Has a Watershed Assessment been done? If so, when? If not, why not?		
10-B	What was the condition of the watershed at the time your group formed?		
10-C	Date Watershed Plan(s) adopted by group, and date of updates		
10-D	Did you use another plan to base this one on? If so, which one? Cite any relevant assessments, reports, or studies that were available to your group when it formed.		
10-E	Use of joint fact-finding to determine problems and potential solutions? How were local participants brought into the process?		
10-F	Use of scientific input (scientists with local knowledge, appropriate technical expertise, and any independent external review); any disagreements on the science?		
10-G	What role did agencies play in plan development? And which ones?	SEE TABLE	
10-H	Cite examples of agency assistance: most useful, least useful or lacking.		
10-I	What funding was used for developing the watershed assessment and plan?		

#### 11. Plan Communication

Item	Criteria	Response
11-A	Are goals, objectives, strategies, tasks clearly stated in a coordinated manner?	
11-B	Is text and presentation understandable to non-technical audience?	
11-C	How does public have access to Assessment and Plan? How were they publicized?	
12. lmp	plementation & Permits	
12-A	Ownership of Plan (who is advocating plan & implementation?); and is lack of complete ownership a problem?	
12-B	a) Would projects be done even without the Plan? b) Without the Group? Any difference?	
12-C	What parts of implementation do volunteers perform?	
12-D	How do you measure the quality of volunteer efforts?	
12-E	What federal, state, and local permits were required for your projects?	
12-F	How would you rate agency assistance on getting your permits?	
12-G	What funding was used for project implementation?	
12-H	Adaptive management - How are monitoring and experience being used to make changes in plans or projects?	
13. Mc	nitoring	

Item	Criteria	Response
13-A	Is there a monitoring component to your plan?	
13-B	Is monitoring a requirement of your funding?? If so, for how long? If not, will you still perform monitoring duties?	
13-C	Who performs monitoring tasks for this project?	
13-D	Where are the data kept?	
13-E	Do you share your data? With whom?	
13-F	How do you use data to make a decision about the project? (e.g., priorities)	
13-G	Do agencies assist you in monitoring your project? How?	
13-H	Do you use volunteers to monitor your project? How do you assess their work?	
13-1	How are accomplishments of multiple projects & objectives measured over time?	
13-J	Is your group / project effective in protecting and enhancing the watershed? Give examples.	
14. Fur	ther Assistance Needs	
14-A	What were the most difficult tasks/issues/events in this project?	
14-B	Would a state handbook or manual have helped in developing your (a) assessment, (b) plan, (c) monitoring program, (d) project design or BMP? Describe how or how not.	
14-C	Where do you see gaps in State funding? Federal? Local? Private?	
14-D	Are there any changes needed to state law to improve state collaboration and cooperation in watershed planning and management?	

Item	Criteria	Response
14-E	How can federal-state-local agencies and interests improve their coordination in the implementation phase?	
14-F	Have you seen any agencies use public advisory groups in their decision making processes to select which watershed projects to support or fund? Cite examples and indicate if you think the public advisory group benefited the process. Is a broad-based public advisory committee needed to make state project funding decisions?	
14-G	What are your Lessons Learned as a message to agencies and the Legislature?	
14-H	If there is one thing to make a difference, what would it be?	
14-1	Please comment on the attached General Watershed Principles. Has your group already endorsed them in concept, or would they be willing to endorse?	

#### **AGENCY INVOLVEMENT TABLE**

- A. Name any State, federal or local agency programs your watershed group is involved with (e.g., programs that give grants or provide technical services).
- B. Name any agency programs not mentioned above that you have considered becoming involved with and discuss why you haven't yet gotten involved with the program.

Agency	Program	Grant Recipient? Year / Amount / Purpose	Technical Services? For What?	Comments / If not involved, why?
STATE		real / Amount / Fulpose	TOI WHAT:	ii flot ilivolved, wily:
Coastal Commission	Local Assistance Program			
	Nonpoint Source Program			
Coastal Conservancy	Watershed Program			
	Southern Calif. Wetlands Recovery Project (WRP)			
Dept. of Conservation	Watershed Coordinator Grants			
Dept. of Fish and Game	SB 271 – (Thompson)			
(DFG)	Coastal Salmon Recovery Program			
	Wildlife Conservation Board / Riparian Program			
	Conceptual Acquisition Program (CAP)			
	Staff - General Assistance			
State Water Resources	CWA 205 (j) - Planning			
Control Board (SWRCB) /	CWA 319 (h) - Implementation			
Regional Water Quality Control Board	CWA 314 - Clean Lakes			
(RWQCB)	Prop. 13 - Water Bond 2000			
	Prop. 204 - Delta Tribs			
	Staff - General Assistance			

Agency	Program	Grant Recipient?	Technical Services?	Comments /
		Year / Amount / Purpose	For What?	If not involved, why?
Dept. of Water Resources (DWR)	Urban Streams Grant Program			
	AB 3030 - Groundwater			
	Staff - General Assistance			
Dept. of Parks and Recreation	Habitat Conservation Funds			
	Prop. 12 – Parks, Water Bond 2000			
UC Cooperative	Farm & Forest Advisors			
Extension - (UCCE)	Sea Grant			
Reclamation Board	Prop. 204 – Delta Tributaries			
	Watershed Program			
State Lands Commission				
CalTrans	Environmental Enhancement & Mitigation Program			
Food and Ag. Dept. (CDFA)	Invasive Weed Mgt.			
Boating and Waterways	SB 1416			
Tahoe / Santa Monica Mtns / Conservancy				
CA Conservation Corps (CCC)				
Dept. of Forestry & Fire	Fire Safe Planning			
Protection	Forest Legacy			
(CDF)	CA Forest Improvement (CFIP)			
	Conservation Camps			

Agency	Program	Grant Recipient?	Technical Services?	Comments /
		Year / Amount / Purpose	For What?	If not involved, why?
Resources Agency	Sierra Nevada Cascade Grant Program			
CAL/FED	CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program			
	CALFED Watershed Program			
FEDERAL	•			
BLM	Staff - General Assistance			
USFS	Staff - General Assistance			
	Research Station			
	Rural Communities Program			
	Stewardship Incentive (SIP)			
	Land & Water Cons. Fund			
EPA	Wetland Program Development			
	CWA 106			
	Nat. Estuary Program (NEP)			
	Staff - General assistance			
USFWS	General Assistance			
	Coastal Program			
	Partners for Fish & Wildlife			
NRCS	General Assistance			
	Env. Quality Incentives EQIP			
	Forestry Incentive Program FIP			

Agency	Program	Grant Recipient? Year / Amount / Purpose	Technical Services? For What?	Comments / If not involved, why?
	Wetland Reserve Program WRP			
	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program WHIP			
	Emergency Watershed Protection			
Farm Services Agency (FSA)	Cons. Reserve Program - CRP			
USACE	General assistance - staff			
	Specific Budget Line Item			
	PL 566 – Small Watersheds			
NOAA	Community-Based Restoration Program Partnership			
	National Marine Sanctuary – Water Quality Protection			
NINAEC	Prog.  General Assistance - staff			
NMFS	Restoration Grant Program			
USGS				
National Park Service				
BIA				
Fed. Highway Admin. (FHWA)				
AmeriCorps				
LOCAL & REGIONAL		l.		1
County -				
City -				

Agency	Program	Grant Recipient?	Technical Services?	Comments /
		Year / Amount / Purpose	For What?	If not involved, why?
RCD -				
Water / Irrigation District				
Sewage District				
Transportation				
OTHER				
For the Sake of the Salmon				
University / College				
Utility company				
National Fish & Wildlife	Bring Back the Fish			
Fdn.	"Cooperative Grant Program"			
Private Foundation				
Land Trust				
TRIBES				

#### STATE / FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF TO INTERVIEW:

1.

#### **REFERENCES:**